DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 852 FL 021 434

AUTHOR Diffey, Norman; Flewelling, Janet
TITLE Heritage Languages in Windsor and Essex County: A Report on Productive Practices and Support Needs.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 65p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Awareness; Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *Heritage Education; Immigrants; Instructional Effectiveness; *Language Maintenance; *Language Role; Questionnaires; Regional Characteristics; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

A study of the heritage language programs (HL) offered by four Ontario (Canada) school districts is reported. Through surveys and interviews of 3 program administrators and 42 teachers, it investigated effective current practices and needs for additional support. Administrators were asked about the scope and delivery of programs and their perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses. The teacher survey inquired about: teacher language and educational background; classroom practices, availability and use of resources, classroom activities, strategies for teaching cultural heritage, and organizational practices for integrating different ages, abilities, language proficiencies, and the general curriculum; degree of satisfaction with aspects of organization and levels of external support; and teachers' general satisfaction and views on the best and worst aspects of the program. Statistical results of the surveys are detailed and anecdotal information and respondent comments are discussed. The characteristics of the HL programs are compared with those of effective language programs. Recommendations include development of guidelines for sequential language programs, inservice HL teacher workshops, HL teacher networking, improved availability of instructional resources, expansion of cultural activities, and HL teacher input into curriculum development. The questionnaires used in the surveys are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 852

HERITAGE LANGUAGES IN WINDSOR AND ESSEX COUNTY: A REPORT ON PRODUCTIVE PRACTICES AND SUPPORT NEEDS

Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Education by
Norman Diffey, Ph. D and Janet Flewelling, Ed. D.,
Faculty of Education, University of Windsor

April 1992

Acknowledgment: Thanks are due to Maureen Schiller, M. Ed., for her invaluable assistance with the gathering and processing of the information contained in this study, and with the preparation and printing of the report.

FL021434

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet Flewelling
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Focus of questions and information gathering procedures	1
III.	Scope, delivery and supervision of programs	6
IV.	Teachers' background and perceptions of the HL program	9
V.	Administrators' perceptions of the HL program	16
VI.	Classroom practices	18
	A. Resources	19
	B. Language learning activities	20
	C. Cultural heritage	23
	D. Effective practices	24
VII.	Multi-groupings	27
VIII.	Effects on schools	30
IX.	Community support	32
X.	Support needs	34
XI.	General assessment and implications of findings	39
	APPENDICES: A Questionnaire to Program Administrator	49
	B Questionnaire to Teachers	55

Index of Tables

1. QUESTIONNAIRE B (TEACHERS): ANALYSIS OF RETURNS 5
2. TEACHERS' DESCRIPTION OF THEIR GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION 10
3. PERCENTAGE TEACHER ACCESS TO PEDAGOGICAL RESOURCES BY LANGUAGE 20
4. TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF ORGANIZATION 35
5. TEACHERS' RATING OF AVAILABILITY OF FORMS OF PEDAGOGICAL SUPPORT 37

I. Introduction

For reasons of geography and tradition the Windsor and Essex County region is one of the country's most important centres for the reception and settlement of new Canadians. Minority language communities are well-established and self-renewing. This is reflected in the diversity and enrolments of the Heritage Language programs offered by the four boards that serve the region: the Windsor Board of Education (WBE), the Windsor Separate School Board (WSSB), the Essex Board of Education (EBE), and the Essex Separate School Board (ESSB). Historically the "oldest" program is that of the WSSB, which introduced Croatian, Hungarian, Italian, Polish and Ukrainian in 1977. With the exception of Arabic (1978), new additions continued to be European languages: Spanish (1979), Portugese (1980). The WBE program, beginning with Mandarin in 1982, has continued to add languages, particularly the Asiatic ones, at regular intervals, with a notable expansion occuring in 1989 when Cambodian, Cantonese, Persian, Korean, and Serbian were introduced. The most recently added natural language is Turkish (1990).

II. Focus of questions and information gathering procedures

Given that Heritage Languages are a well-established component of the local school programs, characterized by both

stability and diversity, this study was undertaken in the belief that they are in general viewed positively by participating teachers, pupils and parents. Initial conversations with administrators produced two overriding assumptions which determined the main foci of this study:

1. that teachers have developed effective practices in varying degrees but may require more informed and systematic support for their further development;

2. that administrators wish to supply such support but at present may lack certain information and means of fulfilling that role.

The concept of effectiveness, when applied to a part of the curriculum, implies the successful interaction of factors which are both intrinsic and extrinsic to the teaching process. A useful framework for the identification of effective language programs is that of Simms and Hammond, which lists the following characteristics:

1. extensive co- and extracurricular activities that integrate language study into the fabric of school life;
2. good adminstrative support;
3. long course sequences;
4. effective use of community resources;
5. accommodation of a broad spectrum of students;
6. strong dynamic staff;
7. provision for in-service training;

8. strong public relations support;

9. resolve to connect language study with the practical and concrete.[1]

From the pragmatic perspective of the actual status of HL programs in Ontario, characteristic (1) may prove problematic, however the others have a definite face-validity. To these we would add:

10. resolve to foster understanding of and pride in the heritage culture.

The present study solicited information from (a) the program administrators, (b) the teachers and, to a lesser extent, (c) school principals. Given the age of most of the pupils, and for various ethical reasons, it was not considered practical to survey the pupils themselves. Information was gathered by means of questionnaires and selective interviews. Both questionnaires were first submitted to a former HL adminstrator for validation.

The four adminstrators were invited to respond to Questionnaire A (Appendix A) which has two parts. The first requests factual information relating to the scope and delivery of the programs, while the second solicits perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses in such areas as teacher in-servicing, awareness of current trends and general morale and, more

---

[1] D. Sims & B, Hammond, Award-winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success, Skokie, IL., 1981.

generally, both the productive and effective aspects and those that cause dissatisfaction. Three of the four questionnaires were returned. The fourth administrator felt the program was too limited within the board to warrant a response. However all were willing to respond to telephone follow-up questions.

Questionnaire B (Appendix B) was sent through the appropriate board office to all HL teachers. It consists of three parts. Part I addresses language and educational background. Part II focuses on classroom practices, the availability and use of resources, classroom activities, strategies for teaching the cultural heritage, and organizational practices for integrating different ages, abilities, language proficiencies and the general curriculum. Part III addresses degrees of satisfaction with aspects of organization and levels of external support. Part IV solicits the teachers' general satisfaction and their views on the best and worst aspects of the program. The questionnaire combines discrete and anecdotal answers. Items of the first kind were transferred to a data base for statistical analysis. The anecdotal responses were collated and examined for general trends and for indications of specific practices and strategies that had met with success.

A major difficulty that became apparent with the teacher survey was linguistic. Language difficulty appears to have played a part in many cases of non-return. In a few instances it

is apparent from similarities of wording that questionnaires were filled out collaboratively. In view of this difficulty, which must be inherent in any study in this particular area, the response rate of 65.6% must be viewed positively. It was in fact gratifying, in many cases, to note the extent of teachers' interest and their willingness to tax their English language resources to the utmost in order to express feelings, in many cases passionately held, about the program. Though we regard the return rate as satisfactory quantitatively, a cause for regret is the under-representation of the Asiatic languages.

QUESTIONNAIRE B (TEACHERS): ANALYSIS OF RETURNS

No. of HL teachers in the boards surveyed:	64
No. of questionnaires returned:	42
Percentage of questionnaires returned:	65.6%

Note: Two questionnaires were returned too late for inclusion in the statistical analyses, where N = 40 (unless indicated otherwise). However these late returns have been included in the anecdotal analysis.

Returns by language:		
	Italian	9
	Arabic	8
	Polish	7
	Portugese	6
	Croatian	5
	Spanish	4
	German	1
	Hindi	1
	Hungarian	1

Table 1

By means of a separate, detachable page teachers were asked to

indicate their willingness to be interviewed. Seven such follow-up interviews were conducted.

III. Scope, delivery and supervision of programs

The languages presently taught, with the combined 1990-91 enrolment figures as supplied by program administrators, are: Italian (380), Polish (234), Croatian (138), Portugese (135), Greek (103), Lebanese (81), Serbian (64), Cambodian (57), Cantonese (49), Ukrainian (45), Arabic (42), Persian (41), Spanish (41), Punjabi (32), Turkish (27), Mandarin (26), Korean (26), Hebrew (25), Hindi (25), Hungarian (16). Italian, Portugese and (since September 1991) Arabic and Spanish are each offered by two boards, with the other languages offered by one board only. Cambodian was identified as having shown a significant increase in enrolment since it was first offered. German and Filipino were offered for the first time in 1991. Also included in the HL program are American Sign Language and Black African Culture. Greek and Hindi were identified as showing a decrease in enrolment since they were first offered in 1983 and 1984 respectively. One board reported a decline in Italian, perhaps because of its recent introduction by another board. Overall administrators estimate an attrition rate of ten percent at the most, giving such reasons as poor weather, competition from other activities, difficulty or lack of

interest. In general however the local HL programs serve a numerically fairly stable clientele in excess of 1500 pupils.

While admission to the program is open, in practice the great majority of students ("in excess of 95%") are from the particular linguistic and cultural background. While a minimum enrolment of twenty-five is recognized as Ministry policy, courses are permitted to run with less. In the case of one board, this may involve pro-rating an instructor's salary. Two of the boards constitute their classes by age groupings (e.g. 6-10, 11-13), while another does so by ability. Hours of instruction, again in accordance with Ministry policy, is 2½ hours weekly, but these may be delivered on Saturday only, on Sunday (Hebrew), after school only (4:30 to 7:00 pm), or through a combination. There does not appear to be any provision for integrating instruction with the regular school day, much less with the regular curriculum. Reasons cited by administrators for the different timetabling models are pragmatic (availability of classrooms, instructors and transportation by the parents) and child-centred (relation to age) rather than pedagogical. The Saturday model, it is suggested, was adopted from the earlier programs organized by churches and ethnic clubs which the HL Program replaced. Adminstrators are generally satisfied with the timetabling mode in use, although one of them looks forward to having more central locations.

While boards vary in their mechanisms for the planning and supervision of programs it is clear that basic curriculum development decisions such as the selection and sequencing of content and the choice of resources are left largely to the individual teachers. Typically the superintendent ensures adherence to board-wide guidelines and regulations relating to discipline, classroom management and hours of instruction. One adminstrator makes use of on-site visitations and meetings with instructors. Another, who had been recently assigned responsibility for the program, reported that courses had "up until now . . . run on their own with little communication from the teacher to adminstrator." On the question of classroom visits the same respondent confided orally a sense of "invading the community hall." Citing the example of one language, moreover, she referred to the transient nature of some appointments. Teachers may be in the area briefly to continue their education. Asked whether teachers are required to develop course outlines, two indicated no but in one instance this will be required in future. Uniform guidelines are not available, whether for course planning or evaluation. The assumption appears to be that teachers will set appropriate objectives for teaching and testing in accordance with the age and ability of the pupils and the texts in use.

IV. Teachers' background and perceptions of the HL program

This report refers to those immediately responsible for delivering HL instruction as "teachers" regardless of their actual professional or employment status. Background information relating to the teachers is relevant in a study of this kind. In summary we find their educational background and professional experience to be impressive, which lends weight to the wealth of information they have to share on different aspects of the program.

In terms of language background a very high percentage (95.1%: N = 42) are native speakers of the language taught. 90.4% (N = 42) were born in a country in which the language was spoken, while 7.1% were born in Canada. Close to half (48.7%) were either born in this country or have lived here longer than nine years. Years of experience in the program (Q. 2) vary considerably. 41% have taught 1 to 3 years, 33.3% 3 to 9 years, and 25.6% 10 years or more. One teacher has 21 years of experience. It is possible that some respondents included other teaching experience, for example in their native country.

Although they are not required to hold formal qualifications the Boards require competence in the language taught. Other aspects of professional suitability appear to be assessed on an individual basis, through the interview for example. According

to one adminstrator: "All of our Heritage Language teachers are native speakers of the language. 97% of our staff do not hold provincial certification although some are certified in their native countries. Basic high school level proficiency in the particular language of instruction is the minimum qualification." The respondent considered these to be satisfactory qualifications. Another administrator praised both the dedication and the HL proficiency of the teachers but had some concerns regarding their pedagogical training.

Information supplied by the teachers themselves suggests a fairly high level of general education and also of teacher training (Table 2). However some caution must be used in interpreting these figures in view of the difficulty in establishing equivalencies between different educational systems.

TEACHERS' DESCRIPTION OF THEIR GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Highest level of education (Question 6):

High school diploma	8	(20.5%)
High school with teacher training	11	(28.2%)
Degree	13	(33.3%)
Post-graduate degree	7	(17.9%)
No response	1	

Formal teacher training (Question 7):

Yes	23	(62.2%)
No	14	(37.8%)
No response	3	

Table 2

Slightly over half the teachers have university degrees. Close to two thirds claim to have had some form of teacher training. Of these 12 (30%) indicated some form of training in another country. Within Canada 4 (10%) have received certification through an Education Faculty.

A realization that emerges quite unequivocally from the teachers' survey is the very high level of general satisfaction with the program. Although there is criticism of specific aspects of the program it is evident that the great majority attach great value to it and feel the students have benefitted much from their contributions. Asked to rate their general satisfaction (Q. 24), 41% were "very satisfied," 41% were "quite satisfied," 17% were "somewhat dissatisfied," and none was "very dissatisfied." Only one did not respond.

Nearly three quarters of the teachers (73.8%) offered their opinions of the "best things about the program" (Q. 24), whereas 61.9% gave their views on the "worst things" (Q. 25). With regard to the former, a recurrent theme is the importance of giving the children an opportunity to learn the language, culture and history of their native countries:

> It teaches children their culture, upholds traditions, educates them about their background.

The ability to communicate with other members of the family and of the community is also seen as an advantage. A number remarked on reciprocal benefits to the community itself:

> It allows the heritage community to be more together, do not feel lost, and to be proud of their roots and be more useful.
>
> The program could keep our heritage alive.
>
> We keep our language.

Besides such instrumental advantages as the usefulness of knowing more than one language and the value to the HL community, several teachers stressed the value of the program for the emotional and even spiritual development of the child:

> It makes links between kids of a certain community, thus helps a youth not to feel lonely and . . . lost in this wide world. It gives him clues to discover his ancestors' heritage thus broadening his knowledge of finding ways to apply the good part of it to his society. It is a nice program!

Linkage between a secure cultural identity and successful integration to the adoptive country is made by another teacher:

> Knowing more than one language is something wonderful. . . If this language is one's native language . . . it is helpful also to our children to be related to our traditions and habits which are very useful to their future life in Canada.

Other comments contain thinly veiled pleas for continued official support of multiculturalism, referring for example to "the ethnic groups' right to learn their own language and heritage by government support and sponsorship." In one respondent's view

the simple fact of the program's existence is "a positive sign."

In summary the great majority of the teachers are committed, in some cases fiercely so, to the aims of the HL Program. They see themselves as entrusted with the preservation of a valued heritage that seems threatened with engulfment by the majority culture. They see themselves as working for the intellectual and even moral enrichment of their pupils. One would expect them to be exceptionally motivated in their work and, having established the simple existence of the program as the "bottom line," they may be prepared (even willing) to accept conditions that may be minimal when compared with those to which regular teachers are accustomed.

Comments relating to the "worst things about the program" (Q. 25) tend to be specific rather than general. Most of the "complaints" can be summarized as follows, with the number of respondents given in parenthesis:

1. Lack of resources (books, workbooks, A/V) (9)
2. Insufficient time (6)
3. Lack of outside support (3)
4. Class compostion, grouping (3)
5. Inadequate facilities (2)
6. Uncertainty regarding the future (1)

If (1) and (5) are combined, the provision of pedagogical resources and the provision and housing of technological resources and equipment are the most apparent concern of

teachers, and this is borne out by responses elsewhere (Part II). Taken with the desire for more time, most of these comments suggest a "give us the tools" mentality which seems to be characteristic of many HL teachers. The provision of outside support such as pedagogical development, even if this may appear to be inadequate to the observer, does not seem to be a matter of priority to the teachers themselves. We will return to this point later in this Report.

The following are fairly typical of the responses to this question:

> Not having enough books for the students; working with books that were published in 1980. The students get bored reading the same book year after year.
>
> We don't have any help in books or audiovisuals. I have to buy my own.
>
> To teach different age groups in the same classroom and not having adequate material to help to teach the language and culture to the students living in a foreign country and also films and audio-visual tapes.

The individual interviews suggested that HL teachers may experience a greater variety of working conditions than the regular teachers. Examples are reported here without comment, since it is often difficult to assess the extent to which a lack of knowledge resulting from language problems or working in isolation may contribute to such problems. Degrees of logistical support appear to range from the full provision of needs (pens, chalk, classroom facilities etc.) to reported scenarios in which

pupils wait in the rain for the building to be opened, use of facilities is strictly limited to "one small piece of chalk," or the teacher carefully restores the class-room to its former condition before leaving. In such matters there is clearly a wide variation in individual experiences depending on the different on-site conditions. Thus the above anecdote is balanced by the following: "The support is great. We get the run of the school while we are here. The principal knows us and trusts us. The personnel is great." As other examples of individual, hopefully isolated, "problems": One teacher complained that salary cheques arrive late, while we are at a loss to explain the case of another who claims to have taught for a whole year without pay until a colleague showed her how to fill in the necessary forms!

To conclude this section, which attempts to profile the background, motivation and general perceptions of a typical HL teacher, the following summarizes an interview with an individual, a teacher of Arabic. This teacher had taught for seventeen years in her native country before moving to Canada for reasons graphically conveyed in the following. "We come from a war-torn country. We've had to run. My house was burned. We've had to run constantly in threat of being bombed. I tell my students that Canada has taken us in her arms, that Canada welcomes us and hugs us, that we must be grateful to be here." She believes in the usefulness of having several languages and

also believes in using cross-cultural teaching as a means of values clarification. "I insist on teaching more than the Arabic language. I help students adjust here. I teach our customs, our traditions, our village ways. . . . I guide my students because our cultures are different. We do not want our children taking drugs. There are big cultural differences, kids get confused, I help them." In terms of support, she receives willing assistance from the board in such matters as photocopying, but is otherwise left to herself. She has never heard of any conferences or workshops but would attend if any were offered. She makes her own materials and supplies her own books, but seems to regard this as a normal state of affairs. Any improvements she would like to see would be an increase in the hours of instruction and an integration of the program in the regular day so that "students would take it more seriously."

V. Adminstrators' perceptions of the HL program

A comparison of teachers' perceptions with those of the program administrators indicates that the latter share a similar general awareness of both the positive and the less satisfying aspects of the program. All three respondents believed that teacher morale is high. At the same time, one felt that teachers are frustrated by a lack of support. Another singled out the lack of uniform direction and expectations, the lack of

resources, and the difficulty of handling multi-age groups.

The positive aspects of the program are essentially those identified by the teachers:

1. Better communcation within families.

2. More involvement of the children in their community centres.

3. Greater visibility of the language groups leading to a higher level of acceptance of the language and its speakers.

4. Enhanced awareness of different cultures.

5. Opportunities for positive educational experiences such as field trips and community presentations. These kinds of activities "make the content more real and of daily utility and help to generate support for the program with parents and within the community."

Among the causes of dissatisfaction for adminstrators, insufficient time was mentioned by one respondent. However the lack of teacher training appears to be stressed to a greater extent by administrators than by the teachers themselves. The concern was expressed that teachers have had no exposure to current trends such as student-centred teaching, that "the movement from teacher-based and teacher-led classroom presentations to student-oriented and student-involved activities was foreign to some instructors." The same respondent sees grouping as a major problem. Multi-age, as opposed to ability,

groupings "met with a certain degree of resistance by a portion of the staff" and are seen to work against the goal of providing "a wide range of activities and experiences that are age appropriate. The social inbalance caused by mixing any combination of primary to intermediate division age students seems to work against continuity and program variety."

Other problems cited were: lack of help from the language community, lack of support personnel on site to meet with parents and counsel students, lack of an on-site coordinator to supervise the delivery of curriculum, and problems created by location of centres, such as attendance in bad weather.

VI. Classroom practices

Part II of the questionnaire addresses classroom practices, the frequency of certain kinds of activities that may vary according to such criteria as "grammar-focused" or "communicative," and also attempts to identify practices that are particularly successful. Besides methodology, information is sought regarding teaching materials, themes and topics, and in particular the teaching of the cultural heritage which the teachers themselves regard as a valuable part of the program.

A. Resources

The availability of pedagogical resources is problematic in many cases. An indication is the percentage of teachers (56.4%) who reported making their own resources a lot of the time (Q. 9). Only one respondent does not have to do this much. The degree of availability of the following resources is suggested by the number of teachers who stated that they have easy access to them (Q. 8):

Songs in the language (74.4%)
Printed texts in the language (69.2%)
Printed student workbooks (60%)
Films and visual aids (31.6%)
Bilingual texts (30.8%)

Songs may be written from memory. Texts and workbooks are normally taken for granted in the regular curriculum but evidently not so in HL. The lack of audiovisual material is noteworthy, especially since the teachers themselves highlighted this as a negative aspect. Bilingual (Eng.-HL) texts are used increasingly in HL programs across the country and it is of interest that they are at least known to local teachers.

Our suspicion that access to resources may depend largely on the language taught is borne out by a comparison of those languages for which more than two responses were received (Table 3).

PERCENTAGE TEACHER ACCESS TO PEDAGOGICAL RESOURCES BY LANGUAGE

	Arabic (N=8)	Croatian (N=5)	Italian (N=9)	Polish (N=7)	Portug. (N=6)	Spanish (N=4)
Texts	37.5	100	66.7	100	100	25
Bilingual texts	25	60	22.2	71.4	16.7	0
Workbooks	50	100	55.5	85.7	100	0
Songs	75	100	66.7	100	100	50
Audiovisual	12.5	20	33.3	100	0	0

Table 3

A number of political or geographical factors may determine the big disparity in the access enjoyed to sources of such material. Arabic is clearly at a disadvantage, whereas Polish seems particularly favoured. (Polish teachers in particular appear to enjoy a particularly supportive professional network, as noted elsewhere). With the notable exception of Polish, the inadequacy of audiovisual resources seems common to all the languages. (Included in the anecdotal information on classroom activities in Q. 11 is a reference to "videos about Poland and Polish culture.)

B. Language learning activities

Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they use various language teaching activities (Q. 10). These are rank-ordered as follows, on the scale 3 = used frequently, 2 = used sometimes, 1 = used rarely:

conversation	2.95
oral repetition	2.93
reading aloud	2.80
teacher presentations	2.74

dictation	2.63
formal listening comprehension	2.63
grammar exercises	2.55
teaching grammar rules	2.54
games	2.25
student presentations	2.23
group work	2.21
memorization	2.13
translation	2.13
music	2.08
reading silently	2.00
acting out real-life situations	1.89
writing stories	1.77
drama	1.60
using audiovisual resources	1.58
writing poetry	1.37

The frequency of conversation as a class activity is perhaps worth noting. Although definitions of this may range from drill-like routines to unpredictable exchanges of information and opinions, oral communication clearly receives emphasis in the HL classroom. Otherwise traditional language class activities have a fairly high frequency rating: repetition, teacher-directed activities, dictation, grammar etc. On the other hand this would likely be the case in the majority of second language classrooms today, despite the current emphasis on communicative teaching. Games and student presentations seem to be fairly popular and even role-play and drama are used occasionally. It is not surprising that activities involving audiovisual resources are used infrequently.

Teachers were asked to mention other kinds of activities not listed, and close to 62% volunteered additional information. Those not listed above include

Poetry competition (Polish)
Drawing, colouring and art
Use of songs to teach grammar
Gym activities with instructions in the language (cf. the "Total Physical Response?" approach to language teaching)
Proverbs
Cross-cultural comparisons.

A question intended to assess the extent of pupil input in suggesting activities (Q. 12) drew responses from less than half of the respondents, with 57.9% of the responses indicating "some" and 36.8% "not much." Lack of maturity was sometimes cited. However a number who had tried this approach reported some success:

> The students are encouraged to offer their input concerning what activities they would prefer. This usually increases motivation and participation.
>
> Almost every month activities are suggested by students to promote interest, flexibility, discussion, involvement, communication, self-expression and independence.

Opportunities for real-life use of the language outside the classroom seem to exist for many (52.5%) or some (47.5%) of the pupils (Q. 13).

In general then, the value of pupils' active experience of language and language activities in personally valuable ways seems to be recognized. This is suggested also by the responses to Q. 14, which addresses the overall importance of the major content categories. These can be ranked using the same numerical values from 3 to 1 described earlier:

The cultural heritage	2.89
Practical uses of the language in everyday life	2.69
Information about countries where language is spoken	2.58
Formal understanding of the grammar	2.56
Literature	2.3

Here as in other parts of the questionnaire teaching the culture emerges as an important priority. Specific techniques for achieving this are addressed in section C.

C. Cultural heritage

Teachers were asked to indicate the frequency of use for various ways of incorporating the cultural heritage into the program (Q. 15). They were also asked to mention additional cultural activities. As only 7 respondents did so the suggested list seems fairly exhaustive. Using the same system as was previously used, the following ranking is obtained:

Songs	2.48
Folk stories, legends	2.25
Religious practices, objects	2.13
Cultural objects from home	1.97
Art	1.92
Costumes	1.85
Poetry	1.85
Dance	1.54
Field trips	1.46
Cooking	1.44
Visitors	1.29
Visits to museums etc.	1.05

Activities that take place in the classroom appear to be more frequent than those involving an outside agency. Clearly the latter possibilities may be limited or, as with museums etc., non

existent for some groups. The religious aspect of the culture ranks fairly high. The role played by religious institutions in the HL program will be addressed below.

Through the frequent use of song, story and legend pupils' imaginations are engaged to place them in touch with the traditions and folklore of their countries of origin. The creative arts also play an important part enabling them to experience and replicate forms of art, crafts and so forth through which the cultural traditions are transmitted. Poetry contests and recitals were mentioned by several teachers in the additional comments, as were plays, movies, magazines, records etc. The latter suggest a more contemporary flavour to offset the "folkloric" associations of the other components mentioned and are in line with current concepts of culture and the teaching of culture in language programs.

D. Effective practices

Both the questionnaire (Q. 16) and the interviews produced many positive responses (78.6% on the questionnaire) to the request to elaborate on classroom activities which in the teachers' experience had proved particularly effective. These are collated by the categories that appear to predominate, followed by the number of teachers who identified them.

a) Language reinforcement
Reading, usually aloud (10)
Writing, dictation, grammar exercises (9)
Repetition (5)
Translation, "semantic association" (5)
Listening comprehension (1)

b) Language expression
Oral conversation (8)
Dramatization, dialogues, "acting out real life situations" (7)
Story telling, orally or in writing (4)

"Participation in acting out the stories or taking part in the games and plays seems to be very effective." Christmas and Mothers' Day plays "have proved very effective in promoting participation, conversation, involvement, self-confidence, co-operation and responsibility."

c) Play
Songs (8)
Games, "fun activities" (3)

"Tests, riddles, lost letters, rebuses, poems, songs."
"Songs are very effective especially when they are accompanied with some drama and dance."

d) Visual and graphic
Audiovisual (4)
Illustrated worksheets (2)
Art (2)

"Practising . . . needs, beside reading and writing, hearing the spoken language. So I prefer to use films and visual aids if available." "Whatever they colour they learn about . . . as well as the colours they are using."

e) Out-of-class
Field trips (2)
Visitors (1)

In view of concerns regarding teachers' awareness of the current emphasis on child-centred learning, it is of interest that a number of teachers (10) reported success with student presentations and other kinds of cooperative and participatory activities. "I find that the students particularly enjoy working in groups/teams. Participation is enhanced through this collaborative learning." "I experienced enthusiasm and enjoyment from the students as well as quick learning." For another teacher class participation is "mandatory."

To a greater degree than may have been supposed, many of the teachers surveyed attempt to provide their students with stimulating opportunities to experience the language. They are parallel, and often integrated, with the cultural activities. Living a language and a culture is the overriding principle for effectiveness in the HL classroom. However, in many cases the process extends further. This linguistic and cultural experience may be used with effect to forge links with, and ultimately survival in, the dominant culture. The teachers are in general aware of these principles, many practise them successfully, and their greatest obstacle comes in many cases from the lack of resources that are stimulating, authentic and modern.

VII. Multi-groupings

Class composition appears to vary from one language to another according to enrolment. At one extreme an Italian teacher has pupils of the same age but of different ability (which we assume to mean language proficiency rather than academic aptitude). In many instances, probably the majority, the pupils are mixed in age. Typical of the other extreme is the following: "Since our class is composed of chidren from the ages of 5 years to 14 years the students are divided into 2 groups. Miss *** and I share the instruction of these groups." Finding ways of coping with multi-age and multi-proficiency classes is clearly crucial to effective program delivery.

Two thirds of the respondents described their techniques for doing this (Q. 17), and 40% made explicit reference to using internal grouping. Although mixed ages and mixed abilities were the topic of separate questions, answers were usually the same for both. In most cases "older" is equated with "more able" (more proficient) and so no attempt is made here to treat them separately.

When teachers group their students it is usually for the purpose of specific class activities that lend themselves to treatment at different levels. The following activities were mentioned:

games (e.g. word games), conversation, story writing, group study, directed dialogue, art, music, reading silently.

A number of respondents described more precise organizational strategies and justified these in terms of dynamics. The following models seem to be those most frequently followed: (1) differentiated activities, (2) differentiated activities with peer coaching.

1. Differentiated activities: Teachers present a theme or point of grammar then assign follow-up activities geared to age or ability. "The formal lesson is presented and the written or desk work is designed according to children's ability." During the second phase the teacher normally circulates and gives help as required. "Grouping gives me the opportunity to work with one student or small group while others are proceeding with their assignment." The approach is essentially that of the split-grade which is familiar in the regular elementary school. "While a group resolves exercises, I teach, leading the other group." However, the age differences are much greater than one year.

2. Differentiated activities with peer coaching: A number of teachers consciously exploit the differences of age and maturity by pairing a linguistically stronger and a weaker student, or else by using older students as facilitators, in effect as team teachers. "I explain in two different ways according to the understanding level of the two age categories.

Then I let the oldest students help me in repeating the same explanation to their youngest colleagues" (teacher of Arabic). "The children older in age are helpful with the younger children. The material is geared down to the different ages. Younger children are taught hand on hand" (teacher of Italian). "The most advanced students will help the ones less capable by means of helping the teacher" (teacher of Spanish). Using students as teacher aids may well be a case of bowing to necessity. However, there are clear educational benefits for the student as teacher, e.g. being compelled to clarify a topic or language point in order to present it to a younger pupil.

Closely akin to the question of mixed abilities is that of integrating native and non-native speakers (Q. 17 c). 24 responded to this question but of these 5 indicated that the situaton does not arise as all students speak the language. Thus about 45% of the respondents seem to see this as a problem. As noted earlier, although the courses are open, in practice very few enrol who are not of the language background. Differences are likely to occur as between children who speak the language at home and those who may hear it in occasional use, as by a grandparent.

One teacher makes it a point "to speak only the heritage language and to make the non-native speakers . . . understand visually and by signals." This approach is definitely in line

with current trends towards the provision of "comprehensible input" in the language being taught. Another teacher has the students provide this: "I give [a] chance to the native speakers to tell their friends what they are planning for the weekend, as games . . . or slow conversation." Otherwise peer-coaching is again preferred, with native speakers paired with non-native speakers or working with them in groups. One teacher tries to make such pairs based on out-of-class friendships.

A specific, highly communicative activity described by a teacher of Italian involves the creation of dialogues between a native and a non-native speaker. This may take the form of an interview in which the non-native must find out background information about the native, and in the process "the non-native speaker is encouraged to speak the language, with the native speaker helping with intonation and specific uses of words and grammar." This activity makes good use of another technique currently thought to be effective in language teaching, that of providing learners with opportunities to "negotiate meaning."

VIII. Effects on schools

A question addressed to both the administrators and to the principals of three elementary schools identified as having particulary strong HL programs was the extent to which the

programs impact on the rest of the school. Opinions appear to be divided as to the extent and nature of this impact. One administrator was not aware of any positive effects so far since the program has not been highlighted by the board. However measures are planned to rectify this, such as newsletters and presentations of diplomas to grade eight graduates of the program. Another respondent sees a positive general effect in a better understanding of immigrants by the other children. One principal sees positive effects for children taking the program but not for the school as a whole, while another expressing a similar view attributes this to the tendency on the part of pupils not to talk within the school community about their participation in the program.

Any positive spin-off from the HL program seems to result from proactive measures designed to integrate the different cultures into school life in a positive manner. One principal described two such measures:

1. "Olympic Week:" on each day two ethnic groups bring in and showcase different cultural artifacts;

2. "Pow-wow:" native Canadians come in and demonstrate their traditions such as burning sweet grass and drumming.

The HL program could easily be presented as a natural extension of such activities intended to raise awareness of different languages and cultures. However despite such

initiatives links between the HL programs and the regular school curriculum are clearly tenuous at present. When asked to describe their techniques for relating the program to the rest of the curriculum (Q. 17 d) less than half (20) the teachers responded and 10 of these indicated there is little or no connection. One stated candidly that "children don't see this program as part of the school curriculum." Of the teachers who have attempted curriculum integration one referred to special occasions such as Christmas or Halloween and two mentioned their attempts to encourage language transfer, e.g. by showing the similarity of Italian and French or by comparing Arabic and English grammar.

Statistics are not available to suggest any positive linkage between the elementary program and the secondary credit programs. In one board some positive effect has been noted for Spanish and Italian at the secondary level.

IX. Community support

Mechanisms for systemic community support of the programs are not yet established in the Boards surveyed, although the hope was expressed for future cooperation of this kind. Contacts at present are achieved through parental input, professional development activities, in-service training and staff meetings.

Asked to estimate the degree of support received from various sources (Q. 19) the teachers placed the HL community lower than families, schools and boards, but above the Ministry of Education, as shown in the following list in which 3 = much support and 0 = no support. (The other sources of potential support will be discussed in the next section.)

Parents/families	2.18
School administrators	1.78
Board administrators	1.78
HL community	1.59
Ministry of Education	1.43
Other HL teachers	1.28
HL government agencies	1.2

The HL community comprises a variety of agencies (social, religious, cultural, etc.) and individuals and one of its strengths is the network it provides for effective communication among them. According to three quarters of the teachers surveyed the community plays an important part in publicizing the HL program (Q. 22). The means of doing this, ranked according to the number of times mentioned are:

Church, mosque (17)
Community programs on cable TV or radio (12)
Community newspaper (9)
Community organizations (7)
Word of mouth (4)
Fliers and brochure (4)
Area schools (3)
Parent / teacher meetings (2)
Theatre presentations (2)

The importance of religion for the programs was noted earlier in

connection with classroom topics and activities. The various religious institutions seem to take a leading role in promoting the programs themselves. One respondent describes how the program is publicized "by the church in the parish bulletin. The . . . community is very well informed of all school activities thrught the year. The community really supports and enjoys the plays and contests, especially the Christmas play."

In an area which may be controversial there are suggestions of ongoing assistance from the HL community in the broader global sense. One interviewee referred to the channelling of books through the embassy of the language's country of origin. Money for resources used to be sent in the same way, but the practice has since ceased. However, the government still sends official exams by courrier for those students wishing to have their studies recognized in the home country. One is reminded of the early incidents once regarded as "interference by a foreign government in the Ontario schooling process" which historically were instrumental in the establishment of the HL Program.[2]

X. Support needs

The HL community supplies varying degrees of support to the

---

[2] J. Cummins & M. Danesi, Heritage Languages: The Development and Denial of Canada's Linguistic Resources, Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Foundation, 1990: 36.

teachers in the areas of publicity and overall morale. It may also supply pedagogical support, as in the provision of resources or through network links with the "home" government. However this is likely to be fragmentary and, more seriously, not necessarily in accordance with provincial educational aims. The normal sources of such support are the Ministry and the boards.

Teachers were asked in the questionnaire (Q. 18) to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the organization and delivery of the program, specifically scheduling, student selection (aptitudes, motivation, drop-out rate, etc., and class composition (size and grouping). The level of satisfaction expressed was in general very high (Table 4), and relatively few suggestions were made for improvement.

TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF ORGANIZATION

Aspect	Satisfied	Not satis	No response
Scheduling	36 (90.0%)	4 (10.0%)	
Student selection	36 (90.0%)	4 (10.0%)	
Class composition	34 (87.2%)	5 (12.8%)	1

Table 4

It is possible that there may be some reluctance on the part of teachers to criticize organizational aspects lest the program's future be threatened by "excessive" demands. On the other hand

few took the "no response" option. The few suggestions made are constructive:

1. Run the program twice a week and during the school day.
2. Increase the time allotted to the program (4).
3. Continue the option at the secondary and university.
4. Limit class size to fifteen students.
5. Encourage more parental involvement (2).
6. Divide classes into three levels (SK-1; 2-5; 6-9) or others corresponding to the regular school structure (2).
7. Make classes more homogenous in terms of age and ability (4).

In-servicing of teachers clearly presents difficulties. One administrator mentioned the variations in English language knowledge and facility and the lack of uniformity in program content and student expectations. Another referred to the difficulty of establishing an acceptable time and place for meetings. In one board an information sharing session has been held and future training workshops are planned.

The limited availability of professional development opportunities is confirmed by the teachers. When asked (Q. 20): "To what extent have you received opportunities for professional development as a Heritage Language Teacher," 55.6% responded "None," while 33.3% reported having received some PD opportunities. Asked to specify the source of these opportunities, only 55% responded, but of these 40.9% indicated the board, followed by professional organizations (18.2%). Evidently the availability of PD depends very much on the

language taught. Three of the Polish teachers referred to summer PD courses given by the Polish Teachers' Association, and the Italian Centro Scuole e Culture was also mentioned. On the other hand a teacher of Arabic lamented: "There [aren't] many sources in Arabic, it's not easy to find documents about kids. Because the language is different, not a lot of help is possible."

Teachers were asked (Q. 21) to rate the degree of pedagogical support available to them in various areas. The results are shown in Table 5.

TEACHERS' RATING OF AVAILABILITY OF FORMS OF PEDAGOGICAL SUPPORT

area	very adequate	adequate	inadequate	n/a	no resp.
planning content	5 (17.2%)	9 (31%)	15 (51.7%)	1	10
course outlines	5 (16.7%)	9 (30%)	16 (53.3%)	1	9
teaching techniques	1 (3.6%)	11 (39.3%)	15 (53.6%)	1	12
educational trends	1 (4%)	10 (40%)	13 (52%)	1	15
testing/evaluation	1 (4.3%)	7 (30.4%)	14 (60.9%)	1	17

Table 5

Of those that responded to this question over half consistently rated the support as "inadequate." Very few perceived it as "very adequate." On the other hand the numbers who did not respond are unusually high when compared with the other questions on the survey. Moreover very few (4) respondents chose to supply additional anecdotal information. The interpretation we suggest is that, objectively speaking, not much pedagogical support is at

present available to HL teachers. At the same time the teachers themselves may not regard this as a major issue. As stated elsewhere they are accustomed to being left to themselves and may regard this as normal or even desirable as long as their external needs (location and resources) are attended to. As one teacher put it: "Basically, I get to do what I want to do. I have lots of leeway." From the teacher's perspective this may be desirable, but certain concerns could arise from this state of affairs.

Administrators were also asked to comment on the support available such as Ministry guidelines. This, according to one respondent, is limited. Ideally "specific course content, teaching strategies and in-servicing should be provided for all instructors and materials should be translated into all languages of instruction." According to another all that is availabe is "a few pieces of legislation and a couple of passages in Ministry documents."[3] A third felt that such support was "good."

Judging from the interviews with teachers a part of the problem may be lack of information as much as actual opportunities. The following comments are fairly typical:

I think there is stuff around for us at the Board Office,

---

[3] At the time of the survey the Ministry of Education Resource Guide, Heritage Languages: Kindergarten to Grade 8 (1991) was not yet available. Whether this document will address the needs mentioned cannot be predicted.

however it is up to us to get it.

I've never heard of conferences or workshops. I'd be interested in attending anything.

Pressed to identify areas in which support would be helpful individual teachers suggested the following:

1. Meetings with other HL teachers.

2. Funding to attend an annual Heritage Language Conference (OMLTA?) in Toronto.

3. Funding to attend an annual regional meeting of HL teachers (one referred to takes place in Chatham).

4. Workshops to assist in dealing with different age groups.

XI. General assessment and implications of findings

The Heritage Languages Program occupies a somewhat tenuous position on the periphery of the elementary school curriculum. In the case of individual languages this may be partially compensated by strong links with the local community or by infrequent injections of resources from the home country. In other cases the global connections have been long severed or may never have existed. In such cases classroom content and practices may reflect educational and cultural realities that are no longer current. In almost all cases, however, the program appears to be maintained financially by governments, physically

by the boards, but pedagogically by the teachers themselves, with varying degrees of assistance from pupils' families, community agencies, religious institutions, and the media. By far the most important factor in this equation is provided by the teachers who are highly committed to the program, resourceful and, to a higher degree than may have been suspected, knowledgeable of or at least willing to implement, some of the current pedagogical trends.

For a general assessment it may be useful here to return to the characteristics of effective language programs identified by Simms and Hammond as outlined in Section II. These were: (1) extensive co- and extracurricular activities that integrate language study into the fabric of school life, (2) good administrative support, (3) long course sequences, (4) effective use of community resources, (5) accommodation of a broad spectrum of students, (6) strong dynamic staff, (7) provision for in-service training, (8) strong public relations support, (9) resolve to connect language study with the practical and concrete. To these we added (10) resolve to foster understanding of and pride in the heritage culture. To what extent do the programs studied show these, or other, characteristics? In particular, what are the particular strengths that can be incorporated and further developed in other HL programs?

1. As noted in Section VIII the effect of the HL programs on the schools is minimal, although there may be individual

exceptions. There are several reasons for this. Boards and schools have up to this point tended not to highlight the programs. However there are encouraging indications that they will receive increasing prominence in the future. This may be achieved by a conscious policy direction on the part of administration. Programs are already well advertised at registration time in the Windsor Star. Within the school program we noted examples of cultural activities which, if implemented more consistently, might help to integrate minority cultures more closely into the fabric of school life. The second reason that militates against a greater effect on the schools is the separate scheduling models in effect. Perhaps pilot experiments with integrated schedules such as the extended day, could be undertaken. Finally, we sense some reluctance on the part of HL teachers, students and perhaps families to seek a closer rapprochement with the school community and curriculum. There may be an unwillingness to draw attention to themselves, which can only be overcome gradually.

2. Next to the support received from the families, the teachers acknowledge good support from board and school administrators (p. 33) and seem very satisfied with the general organization of the program (Table 4). On the other hand more specific forms of pedagogical support normally provided by, or at least facilitated by, the administrative structure, seems to be perceived as inadequate (Table 5). Administrators are the first

to recognize the difficulty of providing uniform planning mechanisms for such a wide diversity of courses. We have also noted that the teachers themselves do not seem to expect much more in such areas than they are currently receiving. For many of them "sufficient support" from administrators, superintendents or principals would probably consist of the provision of adequate facilities, supplies and working conditions, and information as to how and where to direct specific concerns. The obstacles to setting up and maintaining the necessary communication systems, whether logistical and, not least, linguistic, are of course formidable. However, in general, the minimum prerequisite good will is clearly already established.

3. Courses typically run from grades 1 to 8 with relatively low drop-out rates. The advantages of long course sequences are reduced by the necessity to accommodate a wide age range within each class. Course outlines encompassing the entire program would certainly help teachers in the long-term planning of a fully articulated program and would also make it easier to "locate" individual students within the sequence. Awareness of internal grouping techniques would of course be a necessary condition for this.

4. Hl community resources, if effectively used, could offer strong input as sources of information, financing, publicitiy and general morale. This aspect of the program seems at present to

be less developed than it could be, with only moderate support acknowledged (p. 33). Development of materials is an obvious area for community involvement but we have found little evidence of this occurring at present. Such materials would have to be up-to-date, accurate and consistent with board and Ministry criteria. Boards have expressed an interest in enlisting community support in a more consistent way. Clearly identifying the appropriate agencies within each community would be a necessary starting point.

5. Teachers are clearly aware of the need to accommodate a broad spectrum of ages, abilities and language proficiency. Different strategies have been developed to achieve this. Among these the most effective appear to make use of differentiated activities, typically adopting a thematic approach, for example a cultural topic lending itself to both heritage and Canadian perspectives, which can then be used to generate activities suitable for different levels. Various forms of peer coaching can also be utilized. To maximize the effectiveness of these approaches some teachers probably require more precise knowledge of student characteristics for different ages and abilities. Such knowledge is already available in various curriculum guidelines, such as French, Core Programs 1980, but does not yet seem to be adequately presented in the HL resource guides.

6. In a study of this kind it is neither possible nor

desirable to evaluate the pedagogical skills of the teachers. However, as stated more than once, the teachers appear to form the mainstay of the courses. The stability of the programs (in terms of longevity and enrolment) evidently owes much to the commitment and resourcefulness of those that teach them. The general level of enthusiasm is impressive.

7. The provision of in-service training was one of the initiatives proposed by the Ministry of Education in Proposal for Action: Ontario's Heritage Languages Program (1987). Indications are that this remains an undeveloped area. Although there may be some variation among languages, teachers generally lack sufficient opportunities to increase their knowledge and skills in a number of important areas. The needs are partly generic: current pedagogical trends, lesson and course planning, grouping and individualization. They are partly specific to the language and culture and would include, in particular, an up-to-date knowlege of materials and resources. This could be met in part by having access to a comprehensive resource guide for each language, perhaps along the lines illustrated by Yee and Sodhi.[4]

8. To a larger extent perhaps than in the regular school curriculum, HL programs need strong public relations support

---

[4] D.S. Yee & S. Sodhi, "Resource Guide for Heritage Language Instruction: An Annotated Listing of Projects Supported by Multiculturalism and Citizenship," Canadian Modern Language Review, 47 (1991): 712-85.

simply to stay alive. Publicizing of the program within the various HL communities seems to be well established. However expansion through the adding of new languages, presuming this is seen as a desirable goal, would probably require a greater public awareness than at present. There are signs of movement in this direction. In September 1991, under the head "RC board offering heritage languages," the Windsor Star carried the story of a typical HL student, a nine year old Croatian, and his family's commitment to the program. Such "human interest" appeal is an excellent means of raising the profile of the HL program.

9. Linking language study with the practical and the concrete suggests the necessity of providing students with opportunities to use the language in ways that seem meaningful and relevant to their daily lives. The stress on participatory activities and on "experiencing the language," noted in section VI (B) and (D), suggests that many teachers are aware of this need, whether through training or intuition. Appropriately focussed in-servicing might enable them to realize this need in more effective ways. An excellent framework for doing this could be provided by the integrated syllabuses of the language curriculum model of the National Core French Study, specifically the Communicative/Experiential Syllabus.[5] This syllabus suggests "fields of experience" appropriate for different levels of a

---

[5] R. LeBlanc, et al., National Core French Study, Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, 1990.

program, to be developed spirally. Units of study centre on student-driven research projects. A rich source of information for such projects could be provided by students' families, for example grandparents.[6]

10. Closely linked with the preceding is the dimension of the program that seeks to foster understanding of and pride in the cultural heritage. The teachers surveyed seem to see this as an important part of their courses. The Cultural Syllabus of the National Core French Study, though geared specifically to Canadian bilingualism, might provide guidance in ways of integrating cultural activities in the classroom. The biggest challenge at present appears to be acquiring the necessary knowledge and resources to convey contemporary sociocultural realities. Legends, costumes, traditional art and other forms of "folkloric" expression convey an important part of the heritage which teachers understandably wish to see preserved. At the same time, students are likely to be curious about the modern-day lives of their peers in the ancestral country. Exchanges and correspondence, which are becoming increasingly popular features of language courses, would provide useful enrichment in this respect, although clearly their feasibility would vary considerably, depending on political and other factors. Another promising and productive way of teaching for cultural

---

[6] Cf. J.M. Lopes & M. Lopes, "Bridging the Generation Gap: A Collection of Social Histories in the Portugese Heritage Language Program," Canadian Modern Language Review 47 (1991): 708-11.

understanding was suggested during this study, namely the comparative approach: using both the heritage and the Canadian culture to foster a deeper and (with the older students) more critical understanding of each. Some teachers see this as an important means of helping the children become better adjusted to the new culture whilst using inherited values as a source of strength and stability.

To conclude: a number of recommendations may be of interest to the Ministry and to boards, although we realize that few of these are being made for the first time.

1. Consideration should be given to producing a generic guideline giving a framework for developing sequential programs in any language. Such a guideline would be produced primarily by teachers.

2. In-service workshops for teachers could be included in board PD days. The practice in place in some areas whereby supply teachers are required to take board organized workshops on current pedagogy might be extended to include HL teachers.

3. Within specific areas HL teachers should be enabled to meet on a semi-regular basis. Contacts with language teachers (e.g. FSL) and visits to their classes might also prove beneficial.

4. The Ministry should generate and maintain a comprehensive resource document or data-base indicating texts, films and other support materials available for each language.

Ongoing input would be invited from the teachers.

5. Pedagogical and in particular audio-visual resources should be regarded as a priority area. Some of these may be developed by teachers collaboratively, others will have to be located and obtained abroad. In either case, funding will be required for development or purchase and the necessary evaluation criteria developed.

6. Boards might make available a handbook for HL teachers containing such information as relevant policies and expectations, remuneration and working conditions, names and numbers of contact persons and of other HL teachers within the board. Policies regarding classroom facilities and supplies might also be stated in such a document.

7. The Integrated Extended Day could be implemented, at first selectively as a pilot and its results evaluated.

8. Initiatives should be encouraged, such as school activity days, in which the various heritage cultures are drawn into the fabric of school life and made to feel welcome. Measures should be taken to improve the status of the program in the eyes of the other students, to the extent that students of other backgrounds might be encouraged to take the courses.

9. By means of committees or other consultation mechanism boards may invite regular input from the HL communities in such areas as curriculum planning and resources, whilst maintaining ultimate responsibility for implementing Ministry policies.

APPENDIX A: Questionnaire to Program Administrator

PART I: INFORMATION RELATING TO DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS

1. Please supply the following information on languages taught within your board's heritage languages program during 1990-91 and/or to be offered in 1991-1992.

	(a) language offered at which levels?	(b) year first offered	(c) 1990-91 enrollment	(d) 1991-92 enrollment	(e)
1-					
2-					
3-					
4-					
5-					
6-					
7-					
8-					
9-					
10-					
11-					
12-					

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

In questions 2 and 3 please refer to languages by the reference number assigned in question 1 (1-12).

2. Which of the above languages have shown significant increase in enrollment since first being offered?

_____

3. Which languages have shown significant decrease since first being offered?

_____

4. Is admission to courses open, or restricted to students of the particular language background?

5. If courses are open to all, to what extent do students enroll who are not from the particular language background?

6. To what extent do elementary heritage language courses effect the language options offered for credit at the secondary level (e.g., languages offered, student background, course content).

7. To what extent are classes constituted by age or ability groupings? Please specify.

8. What, if any, is the minimum enrollment for a heritage language course to be offered?

9. Is there a significant rate of attrition within the heritage languages program? Please comment.

10. How many hours of instruction per week are assigned to a heritage language class?

11. In which part of the school day or week are classes held?

12. What is the rationale for this particular timetabling model?

13. In general, are you satisfied with the timetabling of heritage language courses? Please elaborate.

14. Please specify the minimum qualifications (education, professional training and certification, language and culture background) required to teach a heritage language course.

15. In general, do you consider these minimum qualifications to be adequate? Please elaborate.

16. Are teachers presently required to develop course outlines?

17. If so, do they follow guidelines in order to achieve some uniformity between the different programs? Please elaborate. If possible, would you be willing to supply a copy of any such curriculum documents?)

18. Are there presently uniform guidelines for testing and evaluation? Please comment. (Please supply copies if possible).

19. Are community representatives involved in curriculum planning?
If so, please describe the mechanism for consultation.

_____

_____

_____

20. Please describe briefly the mechanism for planning and supervising the heritage languages program within your system (e.g. curriculum committees, delegated powers, etc.). (This might be done by means of a chart).

_____

_____

_____

PART II: PERCEPTIONS RELATING TO THE PROGRAM

From the perspective of supervisor of a heritage languages program, please comment on the main strengths and deficiencies you have encountered in the following areas:

1. In-servicing for teachers

_____

_____

_____

2. Impact of current trends on classroom teaching

_____

_____

_____

3. Provision of books and materials

_____

_____

_____

4. Ministry of Education support (guidelines etc.)

5. Morale of teachers in the program

6. Effects on the schools

Please use this page to make any comments or observations on any other aspects of the Heritage Languages program, not already mentioned, which you see as (A) particularly productive and effective or (B) causes of dissatisfaction at present.

(A) productive or effective aspects

(B) causes of dissatisfaction

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS APPRECIATED!

APPENDIX B: Questionnaire to Teachers

Please indicate your Board of Education:
Windsor Public ( ) Windsor Separate ( )
Essex Public ( ) Essex Separate ( )

PART I: PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Which language(s) do you teach in the Heritage Languages Program?

   _____

2. For how long?

   _____ years (including this year)

3. Is this your native language?

   yes ____
   no ____

4. Which country were you born in?

   _____

5. If you were not born in Canada, how long have you lived here?

   _____ years

6. What is your highest level of education?

   High school diploma ___
   High school with teacher training ___
   Degree ___
   Post-graduate degree ___
   Other (please specify) ___

7. Have you had any formal teacher training? If so, please specify.

   _____

   _____

   _____

PART II: INFORMATION ON CLASSROOM PRACTICES

8. Do you have easy access to:

	yes	no
a) Printed texts in the heritage language that you teach	___	___
b) Printed bilingual texts	___	___
c) Printed student workbooks	___	___
d) Songs in the language	___	___
e) Films and visual aids	___	___
f) Other resources (please specify)	_____	

9. To what extent do you have to make your own teaching resources?

a lot _____ some _____ not much _____

10. The following are activities which might occur in a language classroom. Please indicate the extent to which you use them in your teaching.

	never/ rarely	sometimes	frequently
a) group work	_____	_____	_____
b) teacher presentations	_____	_____	_____
c) using autio-visual resources	_____	_____	_____
d) games	_____	_____	_____
e) music	_____	_____	_____
f) drama	_____	_____	_____
g) conversation	_____	_____	_____
h) student presentations	_____	_____	_____
i) oral repetition	_____	_____	_____
j) dictation	_____	_____	_____
k) memorization	_____	_____	_____

l) reading aloud _____ _____ _____

m) reading silently _____ _____ _____

n) translation _____ _____ _____

o) grammar exercises _____ _____ _____

p) writing stories _____ _____ _____

q) writing poetry _____ _____ _____

r) teaching grammar rules _____ _____ _____

s) formal listening comprehension _____ _____ _____

t) acting out real-life situations _____ _____ _____

11. Are there any other kinds of teaching and learning activities that you sometimes do and are not mentioned above? Please specify.

_____

_____

_____

12. To what extent do your students make their own suggestions for classroom activities? Please give examples if applicable.

_____

_____

_____

13. To what extent to your students use the language in real life communication (outside of the classroom)?

a lot _____ some _____ not much _____

14. How would you rate the importance of the following kinds of topics in your program?

	very important	important	unimportant
a) the cultural heritage	_____	_____	_____
b) literature	_____	_____	_____
c) practical uses of the language in everyday life	_____	_____	_____

d) formal understanding of the grammar _____ _____ _____

e) information about countries where the language is spoken _____ _____ _____

15. The cultural heritage can be brought into the classroom in various ways. Which of the following form part of your program (s)?

	Used	rarely/ never	sometimes	frequently
a) songs		_____	_____	_____
b) dance		_____	_____	_____
c) religious practices/objects		_____	_____	_____
d) art		_____	_____	_____
e) folk stories, legends etc.		_____	_____	_____
f) poetry		_____	_____	_____
g) costumes		_____	_____	_____
h) cooking		_____	_____	_____
i) visitors		_____	_____	_____
j) visits to museums etc.		_____	_____	_____
k) field trips		_____	_____	_____
l) cultural objects from home		_____	_____	_____
m) other _____		_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____

16. Regarding questions #8-15, please elaborate on any aspects of classroom activities which, in your experience, have proved particularly effective.

_____

_____

_____

17. If the following are applicable to your situation, please describe any techniques that you have found useful for:

(a) teaching classes of students of mixed ages

(b) teaching classes of students with mixed abilities

(c) integrating native and non-native speakers in the classes

(d) trying to relate the program to the rest of the school curriculum

PART III: ORGANIZATION AND SUPPORT

18. Please indicate if you are generally satisfied with the following aspects of organization. If you would like to see changes, please elaborate.

a) scheduling: satisfied _____

suggestions for change:

_____

_____

_____

b) student selection (aptitudes, motivation, drop-out rate, etc.): satisfied _____

suggestions for change:

_____

_____

_____

c) class composition (size and grouping): satisfied _____

suggestions for change:

_____

_____

_____

19. Please estimate the degree of support you receive in your program from the following sources.

	a lot	some	not much	none
a) students' parents/family members	_____	_____	_____	_____
b) the Ministry of Education	_____	_____	_____	_____
c) Board administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____
d) school administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____
e) other Heritage Language teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____
f) the Heritage Language community	_____	_____	_____	_____
g) government agencies of countries in which the language is spoken	_____	_____	_____	_____

20. To what extent have you received opportunities for professional development as a Heritage Language teacher?

some _____ not much _____ none _____

From which sources?

Board _____

Ministry of Education _____

professional organization (e.g. OMLTA) _____

other (please specify) _____

21. How would you rate the support that is presently available to you (through the Ministry, Board, etc.) in the following areas?

	very adequate	adequate	inadequate
a) planning course content	_____	_____	_____
b) course outlines	_____	_____	_____
c) teaching techniques	_____	_____	_____
d) present trends in education	_____	_____	_____
e) testing and evaluation	_____	_____	_____
other _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

22. Are measures taken to publicize your program(s) within the particular language community? If so, how is this done?

_____

_____

_____

PART IV: GENERAL SATISFACTION

23. Overall, how would you rate your **general** satisfaction with your program?

very satisfied _____ quite satisfied _____

somewhat dissatisfied _____ very dissatisfied _____

24. What, in your opinion, are the best things about the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. What do you think are the worst things about the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!